DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 322 08 VT 013 650

TITLE	Regional Conference on Accreditation of Postsecondary Occupational Education and Opportunities for Research and Development Under the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh. Center for Occupational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Center-Seminar-Conf-10
BUREAU NO	BR-7-0348
PUB DATE	68
GRANT	OEG-2-7-070348-2698
NOTE	94p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Accreditation (Institutions), Career Planning, Conferences, *Post Secondary Education, *Program Planning, *Research Opportunities, State Programs, Technical Education, *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Vocational Educational Amendments of 1968

ABSTRACT

The 2-day conference considered the problems, status and outlook for accreditation of postsecondary occupational education, and the research provisions in the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. The conference was attended by State Directors of Vocational Education and Research Coordinating Unit Directors. Highlights from the following speeches are included: (1) "Accreditation of Postsecondary Occupational Education Programs in the South" by Felix C. Robb, (2) "The Interim Council on Occupational Education" by Jerry Miller, (3) "Concerns of The American Vocational Association about Accreditation of Postsecondary Occupational Education and the Relationship of Federal Legislation to Accreditation" by Lowell A. Burkett, (4) Reports of State Efforts from five state representatives, and (5) "The 1968 Vocational Education Amendments and Their Implications for Developing State Research and Development Programs for Occupational Education" by John K. Coster. Summaries of work group sessions are included. (GEB)

ED053322

REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE 1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

C. CAYCE SCARBOROUGH
CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY AT RALEIGH

CENTER SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE REPORT NO. 10

CENTER FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY AT RALEIGH
1968

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—BUREAU OF RESEARCH
DIVISION OF COMPREHENSIVE AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH
PROJECT NO. BR-7-0348, GRANT NO. OEG-2-7-070348-2698

AT013650

CENTER FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

RESEARCH-DEVELOPMENT-TRAINING

The Center for Research, Development, and Training in Occupational Education was approved and established as a Research and Development Center in 1965, under the provisions of Section 4(c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The initial approval was for 20 months, ending 31 January, 1967. The proposal for the continuation of the Center for five years, beginning 1 February, 1967, has been approved and the continuation program is in operation. The total program, which has emphasized research in crucial problems in occupational education since its inception, has been divided into five complementary programs, including a research program, an evaluation program, a research development program, a research training program (in occupational education), and a services and conferences program. The Center is designed and organized to serve the nation, with special orientation to the southern states.

The Center is part of the program conducted under the auspices of the Organization and Administration Studies Branch, Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research, Bureau of Research, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Center is located at North Carolina State University at Raleigh, and has been established as an integral unit within the University. The program of the Center cuts across the Schools of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Education, Liberal Arts, and Physical Sciences and Applied Mathematics. Cooperating and participating Departments include Adult Education, Agricultural Education, Economics, Experimental Statistics, Guidance and Personnel Services, Industrial and Technical Education, Politics, Psychology, and Sociology and Anthropology.

THE CENTER SERVICES AND CONFERENCES PROGRAM

Dr. Charles H. Rogers, Coordinator

The Services and Conferences Program of the Center is established to facilitate the coordination of the program of the Center with other agencies and individuals interested in research, development and evaluation in occupational education; to arrange for consultation assistance with Center staff members for those who need and request it; and to disseminate the products of research and related activities of the Center. In addition, the Program has provided and will continue to provide assistance in planning and conducting conferences, workshops, seminars, and institutes which either are related to the research, development and training programs of the Center, or are related to the interests of other agencies which are relevant to the program of the Center. Reports of the proceedings of these conferences, workshops, seminars and institutes will be published in the CENTER SEMINAR AND CONFERENCE REPORT Series, under the auspices of the Services and Conferences Program. For additional information regarding the Services and Conferences Program, please write to:

Dr. Charles H. Rogers, Coordinator
Services and Conferences
Center for Occupational Education
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
1 Maiden Lane
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

ED053322

REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION and OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE 1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

C. Cayce Scarborough
Conference Chairman

****

The conference reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

****

Center Seminar and Conference Report No. 10

1968

CENTER FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
Raleigh, North Carolina

Project No. 7-0348
Grant No. OEG-2-7-070348-2698

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY

PREFACE

The conference reported herein, which substituted for the fall, 1968, meeting of the Southwide Research Coordinating Council on Occupational Education, was designed to serve two purposes. First, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools had made great progress in organizing the Committee on Occupational Education during the preceding year, and it was important that knowledge of this progress be communicated to the state directors of Vocational Education in the southern states. The action of the SACS in the organization of this committee was considered a landmark in occupational education, and the chain of events that led to the current status of the program is detailed in Appendix C of this report. The history of the program demonstrates that both the Southwide Research Coordinating Council on Occupational Education and the Center for Occupational Education were deeply involved in the development of the SACS program in occupational education. This conference, then, through its dissemination of knowledge of the progress made toward the development of an instrumentality that would eventually be responsible for evaluating and accrediting programs of occupational education not currently being evaluated and accredited by the existing commissions of SACS, provides concrete evidence of the Southwide Research Coordinating Council's interest in the program.

The second purpose for the conference was an exploration of the implications of the provisions of Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, "Research and Training in Vocational Education." The interest here was in contributing to the improvement of the programs of state divisions of vocational education. A joint conference between

members of the Southwide Research Coordinating Council and the state directors of vocational education presented a unique opportunity to explore these implications.

Appreciation is extended to the members of the Conference Planning Committee and the consultants whose names appear in an Appendix to this report. The report was reviewed by Dr. Bob E. Childers, Executive Secretary, Committee on Occupational Education, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Center extends its appreciation to Dr. Childers for his review; to Dr. C. C. Scarborough, Conference Chairman; and to Mr. J. K. Dane for editing and preparation of the final manuscript.

John K. Coster
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE ii

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I

ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH 5
Felix C. Robb

THE INTERIM COUNCIL ON OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION 7
Jerry W. Miller

CONCERNS OF THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION ABOUT ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION 23
Lowell A. Burkett

A PROJECT TO DEVELOP A SELF-EVALUATION AND STATE LEVEL ACCREDITATION PROCEDURE FOR AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS IN GEORGIA 29
Gene Bottoms

EFFORTS IN NORTH CAROLINA TOWARD ACCREDITATION AND EVALUATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION 32
Herman Porter

ACCREDITATION IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION 36
Douglas C. Towne

THE STATE ACCREDITATION OF FLORIDA 38
James Rishell

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION 40
Ray Barber

WORK GROUPS ON ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION 43

SUMMARY OF WORK GROUP SESSIONS 43

PAGE

PART II

OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNDER PROVISIONS OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

SOME FUNDING POSSIBILITIES FOR A UNIVERSITY UNDER THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968 50
J. E. Champagne

PROVISIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF PART C OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968 FOR DEVELOPING STATE PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION 52
John K. Coster

REACTION TO PRESENTATION BY DR. COSTER 63
Harold E. Kaufman

SOME HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE PANEL FOR CLARIFICATION 65

STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS OF THE 1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS 68

APPENDICES 72
Appendix A - Program 73
Appendix B - Program Planning Committee, Consultants, Participants, and Work Study Assignments 76
Appendix C - A Report on Occupational Education 83

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the two-day conference was two-fold. First was to consider further the problems, status and outlook for accreditation of postsecondary occupational education. This was, in fact, a continuation of region-wide communication of this subject. The second phase of the conference was the consideration of the research provisions in the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments.

These two somewhat different topics were included in the same conference because of the participants. The State Directors of Vocational Education including Postsecondary Programs, together with the RCU Directors made an appropriate working group to consider both topics. The consideration of strategies needed to implement accreditation as well as research provided a valuable exchange of ideas.

There were three specific conference objectives for each of the two parts of the conference. For the portion of the conference dealing with the accreditation of postsecondary occupational education, the following three objectives were specified:

1. To prepare a synthesis of the problems, attitudes and concerns of state leaders about accreditation of postsecondary occupational education as an input for developing regional accreditation procedures.

2. To prepare a statement of guiding principles for developing postsecondary occupational education accreditation procedures in the southern region.

3. To specify a plan of communication between state leaders and the Occupational Education Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for continuous dialogue concerning the development of regional accreditation of postsecondary occupational education.

The portion of the conference dealing with the research provisions of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments had the following objectives:

1. To clarify the research provisions of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments and to relate them to the development of state research and development programs in occupational education.

2. To initiate planning by state leaders for the effective utilization of research and development funds authorized by the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments.

3. To specify strategies which may be used by state leaders in implementing the research and development provisions of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments.

Since there were few formal papers, and since the major portion of the conference was devoted to small work group sessions, this report will be limited to a presentation of the highlights of the conference. The major value of the conference will probably be found in the increased

activity displayed by the participants in the process of accreditation of postsecondary programs and the improvement of research through the 1968 amendments. Certainly, it seemed clear that the participants not only recognized the need for action in both areas in their respective states but also recognized that such action was needed now.

PART I

ACCREDITATION OF

POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

Presentations, Discussions, and Recommendations

ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY
OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

Dr. Felix C. Robb, Director
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

(SOME HIGHLIGHTS)

Dr. Robb reviewed the steps taken by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools since the beginning of its active interest in occupational education. Special attention has been given to those institutions which are neither high schools nor colleges, with plans to assist generally in the improvement of quality in all of vocational education.

An initial step was made by SACS with the Southwide Conference on Occupational Education held in Atlanta on April 5-6, 1967. The proceedings of this conference of 125 educators, government representatives and business and industrial leaders were published in the widely acclaimed publication, "We Shall Not Rest."

Official consideration of the deeper involvement of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in accreditation of occupational education was achieved in two major ways. There was appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Occupational Education which became active immediately and proposed a plan of action to the Board of Trustees in Dallas, November, 1967.

The reaction of the Board of Trustees was highly favorable to increasing the role of the SACS in the area of occupational education. However, it was also obvious that more information was needed. It was clear that the Board of Trustees could not take the necessary action without knowing the scope and extent of the programs and institutions in occupational education in the South. Such information was not available.

Here began a working relationship between the Southern Association and the Center for Occupational Education at North Carolina State University. Through the cooperation of the Center and the Southwide Research Coordinating Council, a survey of postsecondary occupational education programs and institutions in the South was made. While the study was not complete, it clearly indicated the tremendous scope and rapid growth of this type of educational opportunity in the Southern Region.

In June, 1968, the Southern Association created its newest arm: the Committee on Occupational Education. This Committee has begun its work and will shortly announce criteria for founding affiliate membership, leading to institutional improvement and ultimately to processes of self-study, evaluation, and ultimately accreditation. Mr. James Clark, Director of DeKalb (Georgia) Technical School, is Chairman of the committee. Data is currently being gathered on which to base standards for quality assessment and accreditation.

Dr. Robb expressed appreciation to the group assembled for this cooperation in this program and emphasized the importance of keeping lines of communication open between SACS and the states.*

---

*Editor's note: A more detailed summary of the status of the work of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in the area of occupational education can be found in the Proceedings of the Seventy-third Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (see Appendix C for an extract from the proceedings).

THE INTERIM COUNCIL ON OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION: ITS EVOLVEMENT AND PROPOSED ROLE

Jerry W. Miller
Associate Director
National Commission on Accrediting

(SOME HIGHLIGHTS)

Authorization

The Interim Council on Occupational Education was authorized and appointed by the Executive Committee of the National Commission on Accrediting on October 30, 1968, for the purpose of coordinating the accreditation of vocational-technical education in the United States. The action was the culmination of months of intensive discussions by individuals representing various organizations and interests in vocational-technical education, both in the public and nonprofit and the proprietary sector, and came as a direct result of a recommendation made by an October 15, 1968, Chicago parley on the coordination problem of accreditation in occupational education.

At the Chicago meeting, twenty-nine representatives from eighteen organizations which had an interest in accreditation of vocational-technical education asked that the Interim Council be established under the aegis of the National Commission on Accreditating. The action of the National Commission's Executive Committee was a response to that request and an expression of the interest of the National Commission in serving voluntary accreditation on a broader scale.

The Need

Two unrelated national developments could combine to make voluntary accreditation become of increasing importance to the public: the new emphasis on consumer protection and the continuing emphasis on education for human and societal development. In the absence of comprehensive state and federal regulation of educational endeavors, accreditation's role as the protector of the consumer may be greatly increased.

With the recent establishment in the U. S. Office of Education of a Staff Unit on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility with responsibility to recommend to the Commissioner of Education which accrediting agenices should be recognized for what purposes, it is beneficial to raise the question of whether there is a need to provide dual recognition such as would be awarded by the Interim Council. The answer to that question by the leaders of the efforts to establish the Interim Council obviously has been "yes." Their thinking stems from this basic premise: to keep voluntary accreditation free from governmental domination, the various interests in voluntary accreditation must band together to bring about consistency and order and create procedures which will serve the national purpose and which represent a workable national approach.

While the new staff unit on Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility serves an important need for the Office of Education, it would be inconsistent with the basic tenets of voluntary accreditation for such a governmental unit to assume a coordination and policy-making function for voluntary accreditation agencies.

It is reasonable to assert that the concept of voluntary accreditation would be weakened to the point of demise if the regulation of accrediting

agencies and coordination of their activities were left entirely to government. If government has to assume this responsibility through default, self-regulation would become legislation and cooperation would become submission to agency direction. Freedom of the various accrediting agencies to adapt to, and meet the particular needs of, their constituencies would be severely circumscribed.

On the other hand, the various accrediting agencies joining together in a national council to improve techniques, coordinate procedures, seek consensus on evaluative criteria, and subscribe to a code of good practice would serve at least three good purposes: (1) the confidence of the public in voluntary accreditation as serving a vital societal need would be strengthened; (2) the Congress, an apparent and important new consumer of voluntary accreditation, would be better served; and (3) the likelihood of a scheme of governmental accreditation would be greatly diminished.

Though applied to other facets of education soon after the turn of the century, voluntary accreditation is a rather recent phenomenon in vocational-technical education and still needs extensive development if it is to make the contributions for which it has potential. Therein may lie its greatest opportunity.

At this point, criteria and procedures for accreditation in occupational education are not unalterably fixed, and regional programs, still in their infancy, can become attuned to national needs and demands. While building on the experience and sophistication in other areas of voluntary accreditation, agencies in occupational education through the Interim

Council will have an opportunity to chart a course unfettered by traditionally held positions and vested interests.

Accreditation of occupational education institutions will serve to enhance communication, promote the exchange of useful ideas, and improve professional pride among vocational-technical educators. It will help vocational-technical education achieve higher status among students who will and should enroll in its programs, among the general public, and with other facets of the educational profession.

Developments Leading to Establishment of the Interim Council

For several years a growing concern has been expressed by a number of sectors of education regarding the need to coordinate and supervise accreditation in occupational education. Responsibility for leadership in organizing and implementing a coordinating scheme became the objective of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions for Higher Education and the National Commission on Accrediting, both representing accrediting interests which enjoyed the confidence of the public, the profession, and government. Through the joint efforts of these two organizations and involvement of many other groups such as the American Vocational Association, many agencies and individuals had the opportunity to express concerns and interests regarding a national attempt to coordinate accreditation of occupational education.

At the time the National Commission on Accrediting first gave consideration to the development of a scheme of coordination, the Board of Commissioners of the Commission expressed the strong belief that the regional accrediting associations through their institutional type accreditation

should be given the first opportunity to make a proposal for coordinating mechanisms. Consequently, the matter was referred to the Federation, and a tentative proposal was presented in the fall of 1967. The regional accrediting associations felt that they should not deviate from their present policy of focusing on the accreditation of total institutions and also expressed the belief that they should limit their responsibilities to those institutions which fall within the nonprofit category.

The Federation adopted the report of an ad hoc committee which had suggested the creation of a National Committee for Occupational Education. After this plan was discussed with individuals in the U. S. Office of Education and with representatives of the already existing accrediting agencies in the area of vocational-technical education, it was decided that such a committee would not be the most desirable approach to the problem, since it would take some time for the new committee to gain recognition and stature. The urgency of the situation, it was felt, called for the responsibilities to be assumed by an already existing organization which had some visibility and prestige.

As a result of these discussions, the problem was once again presented to the National Commission on Accrediting, and at the annual meeting of the Commission on March 29, 1968, the Board voted unanimously "to authorize the staff of the Commission, together with committees from the Board of Commissioners--as needed by the Executive Director--to negotiate with all of the various groups and organizations involved, toward the goal of implementing a reorganization" plan for the National Commission which would accommodate the coordination of accrediting of vocational-technical education.

Inherent in the plan was the assumption that the regional accrediting association would move toward the creation of units (committees or commissions) to accredit vocational-technical schools in the nonprofit classification with the proprietary technical-vocational schools falling under the purview of specialized accrediting organizations to be recognized by the National Commission on Accrediting. The plan assumed that vocational or technical programs within the secondary schools would still be the accrediting responsibility of the secondary commissions of the regional associations and those technical or vocational programs within collegiate institutions of a nonprofit nature would be the responsibility of the collegiate commissions of the regional associations.

Basic components of the proposed reorganization plan for the National Commission were as follows:

1. A Council on Occupational Education to coordinate accrediting in vocational-technical education.
2. A Council on Specialized and Professional Accreditation to recognize and coordinate the activities of the specialized accrediting associations at the collegiate level.
3. The Federation would be invited to constitute itself as a Council on Institutional Accreditation within the National Commission on Accrediting to serve as a liaison group between the National Commission on Accrediting and the Commissions of Higher Education within the regional associations.

The above recommendations were presented to the Council of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education at

its meeting on April 24, 1968. The following resolutions were adopted by the Council of the Federation:

1. The Council of the Federation endorses the expressed interest of the National Commission on Accrediting in serving, after reorganization, as the overall leader in the coordination, planning, and vitalization of accreditation in postsecondary education; expresses its willingness to participate in discussions to that end; and authorizes the Chairman to appoint a committee to confer with the National Commission on Accrediting.

2. The Council further recommends that the National Commission on Accrediting proceed immediately to establish the Council on Technical and Vocational Education with an interim membership chosen from the National Commission on Accrediting and the Federation Council.

Prior to convening a joint committee of the Federation and the National Commission, the American Vocational Association sponsored a meeting for the purpose of considering next steps in the accreditation of vocational education programs and institutions. At that meeting in May, 1968, the proposed National Commission reorganization was described to the group. Those present, representing the American Vocational Association, the U. S. Office of Education, regional accrediting associations, the Federation, and other elements of vocational and technical education, gave their informal endorsement. It was further agreed at that time that the AVA would sponsor sessions to develop guidelines and procedures which could be used by the various accrediting organizations in order to effect nationwide consistency at the various levels.

In a meeting on July 16, 1968, the joint Federation-National Commission Committee: (1) gave its endorsement to the general plan outlined for coordination and supervision of accreditation in vocational-technical education; (2) urged that accrediting procedures in the

regional accrediting associations for vocational-technical education be developed as quickly as possible; (3) agreed that the Federation Council would determine as soon as possible whether the regional vocational-technical units would limit their activities to the public schools only or include all non-profit technical-vocational schools; (4) agreed that degree-granting technical institutes should have the alternative of seeking accreditation through the collegiate commission or the technical-vocational unit of the regional association, depending upon the objectives and character of the institution; and (5) recommended that a meeting with vocational-technical education leadership be held as early as possible to determine the structure and procedures for a Council on Technical-Vocational Education, the meeting to include persons representing a wide variety of interests in occupational education.

The meeting in Chicago resulted in the following motion and resolution:

MOTION

That this assembly go on record as urging the National Commission on Accrediting to form under its aegis a Council or such other structure as might be appropriate for the purpose of coordinating the accreditation of vocational-technical education.

RESOLUTION

RESOLVED: This assembly, in keeping with the previous motion, urges that the National Commission on Accrediting, in the reconsideration of its objectives and in undertaking appropriate restructuring, give attention not only to vocational-technical education but other facets of education as well, so as to exercise a concern for all of voluntary accreditation.

The following amplifications of the motion and resolution were made and points of consensus were reached at the Chicago meeting:

1. Representatives of vocational-technical-correspondence-business

education should comprise a majority on the proposed Council but should not have exclusive representation.

2. Control of the proposed Council should rest ultimately with a body or bodies of accredited institutions.
3. The National Commission on Accrediting should move ahead with the development of the proposed Council on an interim basis, subsequently proposing permanent restructuring of the National Commission on Accrediting to include equitable representation for vocational-technical education.
4. The National Commission on Accrediting should counsel with the various interests in vocational-technical-correspondence-business education in organizing and selecting the interim membership on the proposed Council.
5. The interim membership on the proposed Council should study and recommend to the National Commission on Accrediting a permanent structure for the coordination of accreditation in vocational-technical education.
6. Among the initial tasks of the proposed Council should be the development of criteria by which accrediting agencies operating in vocational-technical education should be recognized, recognition of agencies meeting the criteria, lending general assistance to agencies operating in the field, and bringing about constructive relationships between the agencies.
7. The type of accreditation in technical-vocational education should be institutional in nature and should be related to the total effort of voluntary accreditation in education.

8. In its restructuring process, the National Commission on Accrediting should consider organizing itself to become the voice for voluntary accreditation in the United States by possibly including secondary and elementary accreditation interests and others as they develop; currently, however, there is no urgency to do so.

9. The joint committee of the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education and the National Commission on Accrediting should continue to function as a mechanism to conduct discussions of mutual interest to the two organizations.

Subsequent to the Chicago meeting, the staff of the National Commission counseled with various interests in vocational-technical education regarding the proposed membership of the Interim Council. A list of nominees was compiled and presented to the Executive Committee of the National Commission at its meeting on October 30, 1968. The Executive Committee proposed additional names and unanimously passed a motion creating the Interim Council and approving the list of nominees as amended, with terms to run until a permanent structure is adopted.

The Federation, meeting immediately following the Chicago session, adopted the following resolution:

> The accreditation of public postsecondary vocational-technical institutions not chartered as institutions of higher education (technically, in the language of certain laws, "of less than college grade") is an appropriate function of regional associations but not necessarily of the college commissions. It is, therefore, the recommendation of the Council of the Federation that where demand for this service exists the regional association should organize an appropriate agency to assume this responsibility.

> Inasmuch as steps are being taken to provide adequate voluntary institutional accreditation for nonpublic institutions of this type, either nonprofit or proprietary, the regional associations, for the time being at least, are advised not to enter this domain.

The Federation has adopted the view that, as one of the initiators of the coordinating effort in vocational-technical education, its role in occupational education will be finished at such time as the Interim Council is operative, except for those occupational education programs found in collegiate level institutions. These will be a continuing concern of the Federation and its constituent commissions. (As a first step toward effecting "interdependent relationships," the National Commission on Accrediting and the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education have agreed to hold joint executive committee meetings.)

Current Status of Accreditation in Occupational Education

Accreditation of occupational education has reached varying degrees of development among the regional associations and other agencies operating in the field. Among the regionals, the following general principle is being followed: Occupational education as it is found in degree-granting postsecondary institutions is being evaluated by the commissions on colleges as part of general institutional accreditation granted by agencies. Occupational education as it is found in secondary schools is being evaluated by the commissions on secondary schools as part of general institutional accreditation granted by those agencies. Within the foreseeable future, these two approaches will continue to be followed by the regionals.

Generally, the regionals have accepted responsibility for the accreditation of postsecondary, non-collegiate, public institutions but the development of programs and procedures varies widely.

A number of agencies currently in operation are serving the accreditation needs of institutions in the private and nonprofit sector including trade, technical, correspondence, health services, and business education. Among those agencies generally recognized as the most effective in the field include the Accrediting Commission for Business Schools; the Accrediting Commission of the National Home Study Council; the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools; and the National Association of Practical Nurse Education and Services.

Philosophy and Tenets

The very nature of voluntary accreditation implies cooperation, willingness to abide by consensus, and subscription to self-regulation, self-discipline, and the highest in ethical standards. The overriding consideration must always be what is best for society.

It naturally follows that those agencies and individuals who join in the cooperative efforts of the Interim Council on Occupational Education must do so in the context of the above attributes if the work of the Council is to be successful. The Council will have no legislative power in the sense that it can impose penalties upon those agencies which do not conform to its direction. Its only real power will be that of recognizing or withholding recognition, the worth of which will be determined ultimately by the value assigned by the public, the educational profession, and government to the work of the Council.

When an agency applies for recognition, it shall be assumed that the agency is in general agreement with the objectives of the Interim Council on Occupational Education and that it is willing to cooperate to that end.

The Council must approach its job with objectivity, flexibility, and a willingness to hear all points of view and obtain all available information before taking action. The tenor of its operations must set the tone for the agencies it recognizes.

Tenets underlying the discussions leading to the establishment and appointment of the Interim Council and which must guide its activities until such time as change and consensus might warrant are as follows:

That evaluation for accrediting purposes of occupational education as found in degree-granting institutions of a collegiate nature will continue to be the concern of the Federation of Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education and its constituent commissions;

That the evaluation for accrediting purposes of occupational education is found in secondary-level schools will continue to be the concern of the secondary commissions of the regional associations;

That the regional associations will accept responsibility and form procedures for the accreditation of public and postsecondary, noncollegiate institutions which do not fall within the jurisdiction of the respective secondary or collegiate commissions;

That the permanent Council on Occupational Education will be so formed as to be responsible to a body of accredited institutions of occupational education; and

That agencies which serve proprietary institutions will be eligible for recognition by the Interim Council and will have a voice in its affairs.

The Role of the Interim Council

The charge to the Interim Council on Occupational Education has been very general with input from various sources. Specifically, the Council

has been charged by the Executive Committee of the National Commission on Accrediting with:

> Developing criteria for the recognition of accrediting agencies operating in vocational-technical education;
>
> Recognizing agencies meeting these criteria;
>
> Recommending a permanent structure and role within the National Commission on Accrediting for the coordination of accrediting in vocational-technical education; and
>
> Giving attention to other occupational education accrediting matters to which the Council could constructively address itself.

Pending restructuring of the National Commission on Accrediting, the actions of the Interim Council will be subject to review and approval by the Executive Committee or the Board of Commissioners.

A proposed statement of purposes and objectives of the Interim Council has been developed.

Immediate Tasks

Developing Criteria--Criteria by which it is to recognize accrediting agencies operating in occupational education must be a first consideration of the Interim Council.

Recognition of Agencies--Once recognition criteria are agreed upon, it is proposed that invitations be issued to agencies to apply for recognition. Proposed procedures for issuing and acting upon applications have been developed.

Code of Good Practice--Code of Good Practice in Accrediting Higher Education which was developed jointly by the National Commission and the Federation of Accrediting Commission of Higher Education and other agencies

concerned with accreditation. It has been formally adopted by the National Commission and FRACHE and it is proposed that the Interim Council, with some modification, adopt the document as a statement of good practice in accrediting occupational education.

Coordination Function--It has been understood during the discussions leading to the creation of the Interim Council that it would serve to coordinate the accrediting activities of the various agencies it recognizes. This would include taking actions and working out agreements on such matters as terminology, consistency in procedures and standards, jurisdictional problems, and other problems as they arise. These will be placed on the agenda of the Interim Council for discussion and possible action as attention is called to them.

Recommendations for Permanent Structure--Among the specific tasks which have been assigned the Interim Council is the responsibility for recommending a permanent structure within the National Commission on Accrediting for the coordination of accrediting in occupational education. It is desirable that this recommendation be made as quickly as possible but not with haste that would preclude careful consideration of such a complex problem.

It is proposed that soon after the initial meeting, a subcommittee of the Interim Council be formed for the above purpose. Such a subcommittee would be charged with bringing to the Interim Council for discussion purposes a well researched plan for permanent structure. Such a plan will have to include suggestions for selecting membership on the permanent council, ways it is to be financed, and a method for including its representatives on the Board of the National Commission on Accrediting.

It would be the responsibility of the Interim Council to modify the plan as it sees fit before passing it to the Board of Commissioners as a recommendation. Target date for submission of such a recommendation should be not later than January 1, 1970.

CONCERNS OF THE AMERICAN VOCATIONAL ASSOCIATION ABOUT ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director
American Vocational Association

Relationship of Federal Legislation to Accreditation

More than ten years ago we heard a whimper from the membership of AVA that the Regional Accrediting Agencies were accrediting institutions and were paying little or no attention to the amount of vocational education or the quality of the programs offered in the institutions accredited by them. This matter was of prime concern to us because many of these institutions were claiming to be comprehensive institutions and we knew quite well that they were not. The question is whether they can ever be. Up until that time and even later we were using the "stick of approval" by state departments of vocational education for vocational education programs to receive Federal funds. Some school administrators yelled "Federal Control." Minimum standards are still applied for State and Federal funding, but as the program has greatly expanded since 1963 it has become almost impossible for a state to police its programs. This situation will continue to be complicated as further expansion takes place resulting from the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 further amplified our concerns because of the great expansion of technical education. Junior and community colleges began accepting more responsibility for vocational-technical education, but they were disdainful of having supervision from State Boards for Vocational Education who had been working with secondary schools to visit, observe, and supervise their programs. In fact,

a movement started at that time to set up separate boards for postsecondary institutions, or attach them to Boards of Higher Education, and then ask State Boards of Vocational Education for <u>funds</u> with "no strings" attached.

<u>Some Concerns and Efforts of the AVA</u>

Little imagination is needed as a professional education organization to appreciate our concerns about programs that would meet no standards, and which eventually would reflect on the ability of vocational-technical education to meet the needs of youth, adults, and manpower requirements of employers.

We also noted the proliferation of effort in accreditation by specialized groups, a proliferation which has not abated but seems to be still expanding.

Our first organized effort five years ago consisted of calling together a large group of educators from institutions which offer vocational-technical education in postsecondary programs. We also called in representatives of specialized accrediting agencies such as the Accrediting Agency of the Home Study Council and the United Business Schools. Dr. William Selden at that time was Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting. He met with the AVA Board of Directors at the close of this session and urged the AVA Board to request the American Council on Education to make a study of the <u>nature</u> and <u>extent</u> of vocational-technical education at the postsecondary level. The American Council employed Grant Venn. His work resulted in the book, <u>Man, Education and Work</u>.

The report of the Panel of Consultants in January, 1963, and the legislation which followed, namely, the Vocational Education Act of 1963

gave further impetus to vocational-technical education at the post-secondary level. One of the four purposes for which funds could be expended was for youth and adults who had completed secondary schools. This legislation also stimulated the area school concept as did Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The area schools took several forms: (1) some were at the secondary school level, sharing time of students in a regular high school, (2) some were strictly postsecondary in nature with all students having completed high school, and (3) some enrolled both those who had completed high school and those who had dropped out of school before completing twelve grades.

At this point I want to interject the problem of trying to develop an accreditation program on an institutional basis rather than a program basis. Vocational-technical education as we view it is a program of education--a concept of education which extends beyond the European notion of aristocratic or liberal arts education for democratic living. It is a program of education to help the individual enter the work force, progress in it and live democratically in the process. It carries with it the concept of "liberal" education, but the liberal or general education is given in connection with the occupational preparation. Vocational education can and should be given in a variety of institutions depending upon the philosophy of that institution. It is my firm belief that voluntary accreditation will never serve vocational-technical education until the agencies which administer the accreditation are willing to accept and are capable of applying professional criteria which are realistic to the programs.

The existing Commissions in most of the regional accrediting agencies divide themselves at grade levels. Good vocational education has not, and hopefully will never do so. Institutional accreditation which uses criteria now developed does not take into consideration the principles of vocational education which I wish to state at this time to provoke your thinking. These principles or the lack of their recognition indicates why institutional accreditation as now applied does not now serve vocational education:

1. Instruction, in order to be effective with vocational students, must be given to selected groups.

2. The subject matter to be taught must be that which directly functions in the work for which the pupil is being trained.

3. Instructors must have been occupationally trained in the trade or occupation they are to teach.

4. Individual instruction should be given whenever necessary to the progress of any member of the group.

5. Each individual member of the group should be permitted to progress as rapidly as his or her ability will permit, and promotions should be made at any time on the basis of ability to do the work required.

6. Effective training for work can best be given on a real job.

7. All subject matter and training should be arranged in the most effective instructional order of difficulty.

8. The pupil while being trained should be placed in an occupational atmosphere and environment.

9. The instruction and training should be based upon prevailing occupational standards.

10. Repetitive training in the various operations should be given such as will enable the learner to begin work as an economic asset rather than as an economic liability to the employer. (Vocational Educators will recognize these 10 principles as having developed from early vocational leaders Prosser and Allen.)

If vocational education is to be improved, and if institutions are going to accept responsibility for vocational and technical education, then these aforementioned principles must be understood and followed. The determination of how well and to what extent these principles are being followed will require knowledge and experience not found in the traditional academic community--it will require that a member or members of visiting teams (and the staff of the accrediting agency) have knowledge and experience to make both quantitative and qualitative judgments as to how well the principles are achieved--and work with the staffs in the institutions to help them accomplish self-evaluation with all of its attendant values.

Some Further Needs and a Warning

I am firmly convinced that if the regional accrediting agencies are to succeed in accrediting vocational-technical education, they must set up a separate Commission or Committee on Vocational-Technical Education. This commission or committee can interlock with the Secondary and Higher Education Commissions to serve vocational-technical education in institutions now served by these commissions and can accredit those institutions which are not now served by existing Commissions.

Criteria have been developed in some states; they do need consolidation, validation and continuous revision which can be done on either a

regional or national basis. There needs to be developed a corps or cadre of selected and competent specialists to staff accrediting teams.

The Vocational Education community is interested and vitally concerned about voluntary accreditation. It believes it has many advantages over governmental control. We believe that the existing accrediting agencies should do the job. There is no need for further proliferation. We want to work with existing agencies. Only vocational educators can understand and develop a program of accreditation that will be accepted by them. We will be sensitive and vigilant in observing the efforts of existing agencies to move into the field of vocational-technical education accreditation. We desire and intend to work with them, but we are determined that we will not be dominated by the academic community. If voluntary accreditation is to work, the people who receive the services of accreditation must be brought along. There is some evidence in the regional association effort that vocational educators are being dictated to; however, this is not the case in the Southern Association.

The AVA Board of Directors has committed itself to the development of criteria, validation of criteria, continuous revision of criteria, and development of expertise of our professional personnel as members of visiting teams. We are ready to cooperate with existing agencies and to lend our insights and experience. We are not ready for or receptive to dictation. We have had experience with the results of ignorance and the lack of attention to basic principles of vocational education. We will not be parties to the violation of these principles.

A PROJECT TO DEVELOP A SELF-EVALUATION AND STATE LEVEL ACCREDITATION PROCEDURE FOR AREA VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL SCHOOLS IN GEORGIA

Gene Bottoms
Georgia

(SOME HIGHLIGHTS)

Mr. Bottoms stressed that Georgia had a need for self-evaluation and state level accreditation of area vocational-technical schools programs. Georgia had developed twenty-three postsecondary area vocational-technical schools since 1961, with no such standards. In 1964, a new Minimum Foundation Program was passed in the state, and this program asked the State Board of Education to develop minimum standards for Georgia schools and to develop a procedure to determine whether or not needs were met. Both state standards and SACS gave stimulation to these efforts.

In order to meet the needs for standards, a steering committee of area vocational-technical school personnel was established. This committee adopted the point of view that an institutional approach of self-evaluation and state level accreditation for area schools was necessary. They formulated a four-phase plan to make the program operational, which included a developmental phase, a pilot program, a revision phase, and finally implementation.

The developmental phase lasted eighteen months. During this phase, five instruments were developed containing criterion items to be used as a basis for the institutions' self-study. These instruments related to the administration and staff, instructional programs, student personnel

services, physical facilities, and advisory committee. The content of the instruments was developed from interview with vocational-technical personnel, materials from other states, policy documents pertaining to vocational education, and other self-study programs. Each instrument was sent to a selected group of area schools personnel for validation. Out of this, a self-evaluation manual was developed, and data collection instruments were included.

The pilot phase of the program, which is to be concluded in January, 1969, required the employment of a full-time staff member. The pilot study operated with six vocational-technical schools, varying in size and in enrollment, and geographical location. The school conducts the self-evaluation, and a visiting committee reviews the findings. The purpose of this pilot phase was to try out self-evaluation for the purpose of determining changes needed in the content, format, and rationale behind the self-evaluation efforts. Four schools have now completed the self study. A critique of the self-evaluation package is made upon completion of the self-study using an interview method. It will not be necessary to follow up and identify changes made as a result of the self-evaluation.

The revision phase will be in operation from January through May of 1969. Using the results of the pilot phase, the entire self-evaluation package will be revised and the identification of state standards will be made with criterion items that can be used to measure whether or not the school meets the necessary requirements. This standard

will go to the area school directors for final approval in May. It will then appear before the state board in the summer of 1969 and be implemented in the fall of 1969.

In developing this program there was an attempt to build in six major elements. First, the involvement of local area school staffing conducting a detail self-study. Second, an assessment of the area school program by a visiting committee made up of a cross section of educational and business leaders. Third, the establishment of minimum standards which area schools must be in order to obtain state accreditation. Fourth, a follow up of state supervisory staff after the self-study, in order to assist schools in implementing those things which have been recommended. This includes both short and long range goals within and outside of the schools. Fifth, there has been an attempt to maintain equal focus on the process and the product of education. Finally, the continuing involvement of local staff in revising the content, format and the rationale behind the self-evaluation and state accreditation program.

EFFORTS IN NORTH CAROLINA TOWARD ACCREDITATION AND EVALUATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

Herman Porter
North Carolina

(SOME HIGHLIGHTS)

In North Carolina, we have a system of 50 institutions which offer postsecondary occupational education. These are comprehensive institutions which offer programs and services in addition to vocational and technical education. For example, all institutions offer continuing education and community services. Thirteen of the institutions offer college transfer programs and are named "community colleges." The remaining 37 institutions are named "technical institutes."

Each of these institutions has a board of trustees, president, and appropriate staff and faculty. At the state level, the system of institutions is administered by the Department of Community Colleges. This department is responsible to the State Board of Education. In addition to the community college-technical institute system of institutions, the State Board is responsible for the public school system.

It was in 1964 that we began to talk seriously about accreditation and evaluation of the institutions. At that time, a proposed plan for institutional improvement was presented to and discussed by various groups at a conference for all professional personnel within the system.

The group that developed the plan emphasized two major points: (1) institutional involvement and (2) self-study. I point this out because it recognizes the fact that real improvement takes place only

when adminsitrators and faculty and their supporters recognize themselves the need for improvement and make the necessary plans for change.

This principle of involvement has characterized the development and the implementation of the evaluation program we have in North Carolina. There are three major elements of the program:

1. An institutional self-study to be conducted by each institution within the system,
2. A follow-up evaluation visit of each institution, and
3. Qualitative standards.

These three features are methods of attaining the goal of institutional improvement--maintaining and improving quality.

1. Institutional Self-Study. An institutional self-study is an effective traditional method by which the institutional personnel and governing trustees examine the institution's effectiveness and develop plans for improvement. The primary purpose of the self-study is to improve the educational effe tiveness of the institution. The very process of self-study, ided there is good involvement throughout the faculty, administrators, and trustees, is a type of professional and institutional improvement. The study enables appropriate people to become sensitive to the strengths and weaknesses of the institution and take corrective action. A Manual for Institutional Self-Study was completed in 1965. This manual is used as a guide in conducting the self-study. The manual includes appropriate questions about all aspects of an institution--the institution's resources, faculty, students, educational programs, and management. These

various aspects of the institution are examined in terms of the states purposes and objectives of the institution. A self-study is conducted within the first three to five years of full operation. The study, including documentation in a written report, requires 12 to 18 months.

2. Evaluation Committee Visit. At the conclusion of the self-study a visiting committee is appointed. The main purposes of the committee visitation are to determine for the institution the adequacy and accuracy of its self-study and to make recommendations to the institution for improving and maintaining effective operation. The committee writes a report of its findings. A committee is comprised of about 20 knowledgeable individuals representing other institutions in the system, the State Department of Community Colleges, and other educational institutions in the state. The length of the visit is normally three full days.

   Experience has shown that committee members also gain much from the visit. The committee make-up and time involved enhance cross-fertilization of ideas among institutions within the system, and suggestions are made for improving state-level operations.

3. Qualitative Standards and Evaluation Criteria. Qualitative standards and evaluative criteria are needed in order to assess or measure the quality of the institution. Standards are needed during the self-study as well as during the committee visit.

We are now in the final stages of completing a document of Standards and Evaluative Criteria for institutions within the North Carolina system.

This document has been developed under the direction of the Community College Advisory Council to the State Board of Education. A steering committee and nine subcommittees were used in developing the standards and evaluative criteria. The document has been developed primarily by institutional personnel, with coordination and services provided by certain staff members of the Department of Community Colleges.

It is expected that the full Advisory Council will approve these standards and evaluative criteria and will present them to the State Board of Education in January, 1969. Thus far, we have used the document in one institutional visit. It will be used as an evaluation tool in five additional institutions scheduled for visits during this school year.

The standards and evaluative criteria are designed as a tool which can be used to assess the quality and performance of the total institution. The document is not adequate nor is it designed to evaluate an individual curriculum or course of study. This individual type of evaluation may be needed, and we will give it consideration soon. But our effort thus far has been on an institutional basis, placing emphasis on broad indices of quality appropriate for clusters of courses and curricula.

Thus far I have avoided using the term accreditation. As of now we do not have formal accreditation involved in the State program of evaluation. However, several institutions have sought and have been assisted in accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Two community colleges and one technical institute were accredited last year. Nine institutions (three technical institutes and 6 community colleges) are seeking accreditation this year.

ACCREDITATION IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

Douglas C. Towne
Tennessee

(SOME HIGHLIGHTS)

Mr. Towne centered his discussion around a research project presently being conducted by the Occupational Research and Development Coordinating Unit, Knoxville, Tennessee. The principle investigators on this project are Professors William R. Schriver and Roger L. Bowlby.

This research will compare a sample of approximately three hundred area vocational school students with a controlled group of subjects similar in all measurable respects, including sex, race, age, IQ, and family's socio-economic status and excepting vocational training received at an area vocational school. Comparison of the experimental group with the controlled group will be made in terms of income, unemployment and occupational, industrial and geographic mobility. A rate of return on the investment in training, including both public and private cost, will be computed. There are also provisions for continuous follow-ups of former students in order that an on-going evaluation of specific programs may be made. The objectives of this research are: to provide a demonstration of the effects of vocational training; to provide a specification of relationships among alternative training investments and employment experiences; to provide immediate evaluation of the effectiveness of the various training programs; to provide an on-going method for continued evaluation of future training programs; and to provide relevant and timely information useful in student guidance and counseling.

It is hoped that this research will provide a bisis for the establishment of evaluative procedures wherein continual directions will be forthcoming, both for local and state managerial decisions. Mr. Towne feels that this is a beginning for the establishment of a more realistic approach to accreditation of postsecondary technical offerings, since it envisions not simply looking at the institution only in the present time, but also viewing the educational process over a long period.

THE STATE ACCREDITATION OF FLORIDA

James Rishell
Florida

(SOME HIGHLIGHTS)

The program of accreditation in Florida schools was inaugurated in 1908 by the appointment of a high school visitor. The first high schools were accredited in 1909-10 and the first written standards were developed in 1912 by some of the leading high school principals in the state. The program for accrediting rural elementary schools was started in 1911 and expanded to cover all elementary schools in 1925.

The major purposes of the accreditation program are to provide minimum requirements for all accredited schools and to provide a stimulus for the improvement of schools. These purposes are implemented by annual evaluation reports to each school, a classification scheme, work by the schools to remove deficiencies shown on the evaluation reports, revisions of accreditation standards approximately every five years, and the accumulation of data from the accreditation reports for use in future planning.

The accreditation program covers all public schools containing grades kindergarten through twelve and all adult high schools. Non-public schools containing at least two grade levels in grades one through twelve may be accredited.

The program operates in each school submitting an annual self-evaluation based on the adopted Standard of Accreditation. The State Department staff analyzes this report for compliance with the adopted standards. The school is given an accreditation classification based

on the analysis of the report and possible visitation by representatives of the State Department of Education. The assigned accreditation classification and evaluation report are then returned to the reporting school.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Ray Barber
Texas

(SOME HIGHLIGHTS)

In the 1963-64 school year there were 20 postsecondary schools (2-year) offering a total of 42 vocational-technical programs. These 42 programs consisted mostly of data processing and isolated technical courses in other areas. The state staff consisted of one person to consult with those institutions and provide assistance as time permitted. Needless to say, the schools received very little assistance. In addition to the postsecondary schools, Texas A & M and Lamar Tech each offered five programs of vocational-technical education. Since the 1963-64 school year and since more funds are available for vocational-technical education through the 1963 Act, the number of schools and number of programs have grown very rapidly.

In 1967-68, 37 postsecondary institutions offered vocational-technical courses and had been designated as area vocational schools. As area schools, they offer a minimum of five separate occupational programs. Most of these schools offer many more than five programs. In fact, last year a total of 254 programs in 54 separate occupational fields were conducted by the junior colleges.

The administrative organization at the state level has been a source of some concern and is one at which the legislature is studying very closely. We have been and are operating under a dual system of boards for vocational-technical education at the postsecondary level.

In mid 1960, the state legislature established a Coordinating Board for the College and University System. This Board has wide authority among the colleges and universities. A part or arm of the Coordinating Board is the Junior College Division with its director and staff.

Another organization, the Texas Education Agency, administers the vocational-technical education for the junior colleges. This administrative organization consists of a State Board of Education which serves also as the State Board for Vocational Education, the Commissioner of Education and his staff, the Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education, the Director of Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Education and his support staff. The support staff consists of six program specialists who are available for consultative service to the institutions.

In order to more closely coordinate the activities of both organizations, representatives from each board meet monthly to work out problems and to coordinate the activities of each organization. These meetings have led to many revealing and fruitful understandings. Presently, the two organizations are working on improved reporting systems, evaluation systems, and methods of identifying more accurately instructional costs related to individual programs. This dual system of boards creates some problems to local administrators.

We are attempting, however, to remedy some of our problems. In evaluation, although no formal publication is presently available, the Postsecondary Vocational-Technical Division has under devleopment an instrument that will be used in evaluating the programs. This instrument supports the state plan. The results of these evaluations will be used

to guide the Division in providing assistance to the schools and assisting them in upgrading their programs. Some of the major areas that are or will be included in the evaluation are: (1) curriculum, (2) qualification of the instructional staff, (3) equipment and supplies, (4) physical facilities, (5) administrative support, (6) public relations, and (7) students. The evaluation instrument is intended to be used in a self-evaluation visit from the Agency staff. Some field testing and pilot work has been done and it is hoped to make a widespread use as soon as practical.

Major problems in vocational-technical education in our state among the schools and on the state level include the problem of administration, adequate funding of programs, and improved follow-up and evaluation. Although major accomplishments have been made in the past, we feel that the proper groundwork has been laid to enable the state to make even more progress in these areas in the future. The college presidents, State Advisory Committee for Vocational Education, the vocational directors, and the state staff have been working together to study the needs and are moving and making positive contributions which will help upgrade the programs and provide better training for students.

WORK GROUPS ON ACCREDITATION OF POSTSECONDARY OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

The purpose of the small group discussions was to afford each participant the opportunity to "have his say" about accreditation of postsecondary occupational education. Specifically, the small groups were asked to make a list of questions, problems, concerns, and suggestions that state leaders see developing more effective accreditation procedures for postsecondary occupational education. Furthermore, each group was asked to make a start toward a comprehensive statement of Guiding Principles for Accreditation of Postsecondary Occupational Education. In other words, this was an opportunity for participants in this conference to supply needed inputs to regional accreditation. Finally, the groups were asked to make specific suggestions for a Continuing Plan for 2-way Communication between state leaders and the Occupational Education Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

The summary of the reports from the work groups follows. There has been no attempt to include all of the many questions raised; rather, the editor has attempted to select a limited number of the major points covered in the sessions.

SUMMARY OF WORK GROUP SESSIONS

Questions

1. Are all potential inputs on accreditation being fed into the Southern Association? Special emphasis should be directed toward

securing the various instruments representing criteria for accreditation of postsecondary occupational education.

2. Can the accreditation procedures be designed so as to strengthen the occupational programs on comprehensive institutions?
3. Can the gaps in thinking and communications between programs, interested agencies and institutions (and related orientations) be bridged by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools?
4. What information can be disseminated to the state now, or in the near future, to assist them in starting preparations immediately?
5. Can state directors provide financial assistance to the committee to expedite the process?
6. What will be the role of the Southwide Research Coordinating Council in assisting the committee?
7. Can the various RCU's submit standards for the consideration of the committee?
8. In order to accredit an institution, would you have one commission to accredit the college parallel program at the institution and another commission to accredit the technical institute program?
9. How can you use the existing standards to accredit technical institutions? For example, what should a library in a technical institute look like?
10. Are vocational and technical programs similar enough to be evaluated by one set of criteria? Possibly, some areas such as administration are relatively stable but some vocational or technical programs may be more diverse and less amenable to a single set of program criteria.

Problems

1. If teacher certification standards are set too high (i.e., degrees, hours, credit, etc.) how can we get or keep good technically qualified teachers? Accreditation could be very difficult if teacher certification and teacher education are not involved.
2. How can we develop accreditation criteria which are valid both philosophically and empirically?
3. Accreditation criteria and visiting teams could overlook the total occupational needs of the community in making their evaluations. Accreditation should look at what schools are not doing as well as what they are doing. We normally look at only those programs which are being offered--not those which should be offered. Accreditation should be on the basis of the extent to which people in the community are being served.
4. The already existing problem of communication among commissions is going to be increased and because of the inherent cutting across commissions which is involved, some means of increasing and maintaining communications must be developed.

Concerns

1. The standards for teacher certification should be looked at closely. Fair standards must be developed to take into account the potential teacher coming out of industry and the non-degree teacher. Realistic criteria for certification will have to be set up to provide for these contingencies, as well as for the teacher with the usual academic qualifications.

2. Accreditation criteria may become static and inappropriate unless frequent reviews are made of the instruments used by the visiting team.
3. Present evaluation of comprehensive institutions does an injustice to occupational programs. Procedures should not perpetuate this but rather strengthen such programs.
4. Because occupational programs, unlike academic programs, are unique, criteria must be program-linked whether accreditation is program or institution in scope.
5. There is some concern over the fact that some schools with highly academic programs may meet accreditation standards, but they apparently are not meeting the needs of a number of their pupils who need vocational education.

Guiding Principles

1. Each of the schools undergoing a visit by a committee should be encouraged to invite a representative or representatives on the visiting team who represents the areas offered in the schools being evaluated.
2. Minimum standards should be developed for the composition of the evaluating committee itself.
3. As a measure of the effectiveness of a school, at least four items should be carefully examined: (1) income; (2) input; (3) output; (4) outcome (follow-up).
4. Degrees should not be the only criterion for evaluation of teachers.

5. Where accreditation associations are already operational in schools, junior colleges and the like, accreditation of occupational education become a part of that set up rather than a separate agency. However, guarantees should be made to assume qualified representation to evaluate the various vocational programs in the school or college.
6. Valid criteria for accreditation must be adopted which accurately reflect not only the quality of the existing programs but the comprehensiveness of the curricula offerings in terms of the total occupational needs of the community.
7. Accreditation criteria must be validated philosophically and empirically by occupational educators.
8. Accreditation criteria should reflect the total training needs of the individual. This refers to his need for remedial, related, and academic instruction as well as his need for skill development.
9. Vocational educators must be involved in the process of developing criteria and procedures.
10. A part of the procedures should include the extent to which a program or institution is serving the needs of a population and community.
11. Caution must be exercised to assure that procedures developed do not invite rigidity but rather maintain program flexibility (e.g., student qualification coupled with student need).
12. The procedures should not be confined to examining process only, as seems to be the case in secondary and college accreditation, but must also look at the product of the process.

Two-way Communication

1. A person in each state to serve in liaison capacity between state group (state accrediting agencies, proprietary groups, etc.) and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The state RCU could serve as clearinghouse in each state.
2. Make sure committee has copies of all materials developed by each of the states.
3. Development of newsletter from Executive Secretary of the Committee after he has been hired.
4. Series of workshops addressing themselves to some of the concerns or issues expressed at this conference.
5. The national committee set up a time frame of actions to indicate a "by when date" for each action as a basis of the states of its plan for developing accreditation. States in turn develop its time frame listing actions "by when date" for each action.
6. Continue liaison between Southwide Research Coordinating Council and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools through informal contact with the Director of the Center for Occupational Education and conferences as needed.
7. Encourage Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to secure inputs from outside the region such as:
   a. the evaluation project at the Ohio State University being conducted by Dr. Harold Starr and
   b. the accreditation efforts of other states such as North Carolina, Florida, and others.

PART II

OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Presentations, Discussions, and Recommendations

SOME FUNDING POSSIBILITIES FOR A UNIVERSITY UNDER
THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968

Analysis Prepared By
J. E. Champagne

I. Part A, Section 103 (a) authorizes the transfer from HEW to the Manpower Administration (DOL) up to $5,000,000 per fiscal year for national, regional, state, and local studies and projections of manpower needs for the use and guidance of federal, state, and local officials in planning or providing for training programs.

II. Part C authorizes up to 10% of the total authorization for regular programs for grants and contracts for research and related activities in vocational-technical education. Authorization for FY 1969 is $35.5 million, FY 70--$56.5 million; FY 71--$67.5 million; FY 72--$67.5 million. Fifty percent will be held by the Commissioner in Washington for funding at his discretion and fifty percent will be allocated to the states. The states may then pay up to 75% of the budget of the Research Coordinating Units* and up to ninety percent of projects to local school districts, agencies, universities, etc. (It is my interpretation from other sections of the Act that research and experimental projects for youth, the disadvantaged, and the handicapped will be given some priority.)

*Mr. Ray Barber in Austin heads the Texas RCU.

III. Part D authorizes $15,000,000 for FY 69, $57,500,000 for FY 70, and $75,000,000 for FY 71, FY 72 for exemplary projects. Emphasis in this part is specifically placed on projects related to youth

unemployment and to effecting closer cooperation between public education and manpower agencies. Fifty percent of the funds are to be allocated to the states for funding projects of local significance and fifty percent of the funds are to be held by the Commissioner in Washington for his funding.

IV. Part I authorizes $7,000,000 for FY 69 and $10,000,000 for FY 70 for projects in curriculum development for new and changing occupations and to improve existing materials. Funding will be made by the Commissioner with the approval of the states.

V. Additional Comments:

The funds listed above are authorizations and not appropriations, but it is expected that appropriations will match authorizations. It should also be noted that up to 25% of funds for regular programs must be expended on the disadvantaged and handicapped and research and exemplary programs are needed in that area. There is considerable emphasis placed on youth unemployment in the Act as well as on program evaluation. Finally, there are other funding possibilities in the Act for the University in professional development areas, teacher training, etc.

PROVISIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF PART C OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1968 FOR DEVELOPING STATE PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

John K. Coster
Director
Center for Occupational Education
North Carolina State University at Raleigh

Since the provisions and implications of Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 are of such apparent significance to both program administrators and researchers throughout the South, the members of the Planning Committee agreed to devote the entire second day of the Fall Meeting of the Southwide Research Coordinating Council on Occupational Education to an examination of these provisions and implications. In order to provide a framework for looking at the amendments, the Planning Committee specified three objectives designed to guide this portion of the conference. The objectives are:

1. To clarify the research provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and relate them to the development of state research and development programs in occupational education.
2. To initiate planning by state leaders for the effective utilization of research and development funds authorized under the provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.
3. To specify strategies which may be used by state leaders in implementing the research and development provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

In addressing itself to major issues and problems inherent in the development of strategies and plans for the implementation of the provisions under Part C of the 1968 amendments, and in presenting an analysis

and interpretation of the provisions for the act with suggestions for preparing to implement its provisions within each State, this paper will try to contribute to the attainment of all three of the specified objectives. It should be kept in mind that this paper does not represent an official document, but rather the interpretations of one person regarding the possibilities for implementation and the developmental processes which are suggested by an analysis of the act.

In the material which follows, each of the three conference objectives will be specified separately and commentary and suggestions provided as a means of extending and expanding the possibilities for interpretation and action.

Objective I

> To clarify the research provisions of the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968 and to relate them to the development of state research and development programs in occupational education.

The treatment of Objective I is straightforward. Clearly the issue of control of research and training funds is crucial. Whereas in the Vocational Education Act of 1963 the control of funds was reserved to the U. S. Commissioner of Education, in the Vocational Amendments of 1968 the control has been divided between the State Boards of Vocational Education and the Commissioner. Section 131(a) of the act reserves 50 percent of the funds to the Commissioner of Education and Section 131(b) of the act reserves 50 percent of the funds to the State Boards for Vocational Education. The immediate result of these provisions is to make available one-half of the research and development funds for high priority projects and programs that relate to the development of state programs of vocational education and to allocate one-half of the funds to projects or programs that relate to regional and national projects or projects with

implications that have impact on broader target areas.

The provisions of the act with regard to the funds to be reserved to the State Boards are very broad. They provide for payment of up to 75 percent of the support of research coordinating units of the State and for payment of up to 90 percent of costs of (1) research and training projects, (2) experimental, pilot, and development programs, and (3) dissemination of research findings.

Of special importance to the group assembled here is the vote of confidence given by the Congress through provisions of this act to the furtherance of the work of the Research Coordinating Units throughout the nation. Even though the research coordinating units are to be supported from funds made available to the states through the act, their mention in the act indicates clearly that the potentialities of the research coordinating units have been assessed carefully and judged to have been productive in the past and potentially productive in the future.

Even though the act provides that 50 percent of the funds appropriated under Section C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 are to be reserved to the states, undoubtedly specific guidelines will be developed which require that the manner in which funds will be used will be specified in the section of the state plan that pertains to research. Presumably this portion of the state plan will need to be approved by competent authority in the U. S. Office of Education before it can be implemented in the State. The restrictions imposed upon the act however are minimal, and it may be interpreted that the states will have wide latitude in setting forth the priorities and conditions under which the funds available to state boards may be used for research.

Implications of Provisions

There seem to be a number of implications which may be drawn from a careful reading of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

First, funds reserved to the states may be used to support projects and programs designed to obtain answers to immediate problems at the state and local levels. Thus, theoretically at least, the funds will be used to obtain answers and to support research which is of immediate concern in the development of vocational education programs at the state level. Also, theoretically at least, there is an underlying assumption that results will be more fruitful if the basic control of the funds is transferred to administrative authority which is relatively close to the action.

Next, a careful reading of other provisions of the vocational education amendments along with interpretations that have been made of the act, indicates that the states will have relatively wide latitude in the use of research funds made available. In other words the states will be able to write their own program in terms of how these funds will be used. The checks and balances that will be imposed at the federal level remain to be seen. Indeed, the guidelines have not yet been written regarding the use of funds at the state level. At this juncture, however, it would appear that the states have been given the responsibility and the opportunity to write such guidelines as may be desirable and necessary for the support of their own programs.

Finally, the basic responsibility for research has been vested in the State Board through its administration of the State Plan. Each State will provide a section in its plan which will deal with the organization and administration of the research program in the State. This increases

the possibility that research may be integrated with the decision-making function of vocational education, therefore allowing research to be viewed as a tool in management, an instrument in program development, a technique for evaluation, and a resource for developmental change.

Objective II

To initiate planning by state leaders for the effective utilization of research and development funds authorized under the provisions of the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968.

The second objective of this conference will be achieved if the states represented here take the initiative in beginning the planning process for the utilization funds available under the 1968 Amendments. As I have indicated previously, the act is general on the subject of how funds may be used. Since this is the case, this paper will offer a set of suggestions which might be followed by the states during the development of their own programs for the utilization of funds.

One worthwhile approach would appear to be the establishment of a task force on research and development, headed by the director of the state research coordinating unit. Such a task force would (1) develop a policy statement for research and development for the state and (2) develop the state plan for research. The policy statement, which of necessity would be a relatively broad statement, could be initiated by the task force and forwarded through the state director of vocational education to the chairman of the state board of education for consideration. It should become the guiding document in the state for the state's research program.

Writing the specific provisions of the state's plan cannot be accomplished in finality until guidelines for the development of state plans

have been prepared by the staff of the U. S. Office of Education. However, it would seem the preliminary work on the development of a state plan might be initiated by the task force, and if this is done, attention might well be given to the following items:

1. How the research and development program will be administered and by whom will it be administered.
2. How priorities for research and development activity will be established.
3. How projects will be selected.
4. How research funds will be matched with state and local funds.
5. How projects will be monitored and by whom will they be monitored.
6. How results will be evaluated.

Objective III

To specify strategies which may be used by state leaders in implementing the research and development provisions of the Vocational Education Amendment of 1968.

It is to be expected that each state will develop its own strategies for implementing the provisions under Section C of the act. The suggestions offered here are based on the assumption that research coordinating units have already been established in the majority of the states, and consequently it is both logical and efficient that the additional functions to be assigned under the provisions of the act be allocated to the research coordinating units. In this light, the following suggestions appear to be appropriate:

1. An expanded organizational structure including a research management center should be established in each state.

In connection with this, it is suggested that the scope of the research coordinating unit be expanded to include research management. Furthermore, the staff of the research coordinating units should be expanded to include persons who are specialists in project evaluation both for developmental and related projects and programs, and for exemplary and innovative projects and programs. Finally, it is suggested that the staff of present research coordinating units be expanded to include persons who are specialists in dissemination and interpretation.

2. The establishment of communication linkage between administration and researchers.

This step is essential if the new system is to function. Regardless of whether the research coordinating unit is located in the state department of education or at a university, it is essential that the function of the research coordinating unit be viewed as an arm of the state director of vocational education or such state officials as may be involved in the administration of vocational and technical programs. The linkage between the unit and the director of vocational education is a matter of administrative fiat. The linkage between researchers in the state who may be interested in addressing the problems of vocational and technical education and the unit and its administrative superstructure is more tenuous. To bring to bear the most effective and the most competent personnel resources on problems of vocational education, it is necessary that linkages be established between or among those researchers representing the disciplines or fields of interest to vocational education and researchers presently involved in vocational education, as well

as with those involved in the administration function of vocational education. In connection with this, attention needs to be given to the appointment of a state research advisory council charged with the responsibility for coordinating the entire research and development program of the state, for developing and establishing a system for determining priorities for research and related activity, and for evaluating potential research projects in terms of these priorities. Also, a system needs to be established for receiving, approving, budgeting, monitoring, and terminating projects.

To effectively operate the research program in the state, it will be necessary that attention be given to projects which may be generated within the State Division of Vocational Education to solve long-range operational problems as well as the immediate problems faced by the administrators of the program. These projects may fall under the category of requests for proposals, and researchers throughout the state may be encouraged to bid or submit proposals to conduct the research with an adequate projects specification to denote the end product that will be produced at the termination of the project. The system, however, should provide for a two-way linkage between the administration and researchers to the extent that researchers will not be discouraged from submitting proposals dealing with problems in which they have special interests and for which they can demonstrate potential contributions to the improvement of vocational and technical education in the state.

3. <u>The establishment of a system of quality control both in terms of content and methodology and in terms of relevance to occupational education</u>.

The quality control system is actually part of the total system alluded to in the preceding specification dealing with the monitoring of projects. The underlying premise is that funds invested in research and related activity from state sources or Federal funds which the state has been given the responsibility to husband must be utilized in a manner that will maximize the probability of obtaining the desired results. Quality control refers to insistence that the objectives of the project be focused upon the problems of interest, that the methodology be appropriate in terms of the objectives, and that the execution of the project be conducted in such a manner as to maximize the probability of obtaining significant information and minimize the probability of mismanagement of projects.

4. <u>The establishment of a system of feedback of results into the policy-making program development operation</u>.

The establishment of this system essentially indicates that the principles underlying operational research will be incorporated into the management of the educational and research enterprise system.

<u>What Can be Expected and What Can be Achieved</u>

The implementation of Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 which pertains to increased responsibility for research at the state level suggests the following:

1. Increased responsibility for Research Coordinating Units. Research Coordinating Units were established to function as coordinating and stimulating functions for research and related activity in the several states. To this responsibility should be added the responsibility for research management for the development of the research program in the states and possibly for the management of exemplary programs under Part E of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.
2. Close coordination between research and administration. The gap between research and administration must be bridged. The research and related activity function must be made subservient to the program administration function and must be made highly responsive to the need for priorities on which state programs of vocational education can be developed.
3. Immediate response from research to program development. The gap between program planning and research and development also must be bridged. Research must provide the information which is needed in order to plan effective programs of vocational education.
4. Attack on problems of immediate concern. Research must be responsive to the short-range operational problems of vocational-technical education. These are the problems that may be identified by the research coordinating council or anybody connected with the administration and development of programs for

vocational education. What must be developed is a core of personnel who can be responsive to immediate problems and who can work effectively to resolve these problems in an expeditious manner.

5. Close coordination among states on problems of mutual interest. Many of the problems that confront vocational education cut across state lines. Replication of the research project is desired in order to verify the generalizability of findings. Continuous effort must be maintained in order to maximize the possibilities for replication and to generalize to the broadest possible population of interest.

REACTION TO PRESENTATION BY DR. COSTER

Harold F. Kaufman, Director
Social Science Research Center
Mississippi State University

Dr. Kaufman's reaction was generally favorable and in agreement with the major points in Dr. Coster's presentation. However, he suggested that there were problems inherent in trying to do research in on-going programs. Similarly, there are some basic difficulties in coordinating the efforts of the researchers and the educational leader or practitioner. These are indicated in the following statement by Dr. Kaufman:

> The continuing dialogue between the policy-maker and practitioner on the one hand and the researcher and theorist on the other may be analyzed as a process with different phases of activity through time. This activity studied within a time sequence has for want of a better name be termed the research and interpretation process. Within the last decade or more, increased attention has been paid by social scientists to the processes by which research is interpreted and utilized by various publics. These treatments range from theoretical models to specific and popularly presented case studies (Lippitt, 1958; Warren, 1963; and King, 1958; see also the Sociologists, the Policy-Makers and the Public, Vol. I of the Fifth World Congress of Sociology, International Sociological Association, 1962).

Phases of the Process

Three phases of the research and interpretation process are noted here. They are as follows:

1. Defining the practical problem or problems of concern to a given public.
2. Bringing to bear the findings of sociology.
3. Interpreting the research so that the practitioners concerned can utilize it.

In order to understand the practical problem, it is necessary that the sociologist spend considerable time with his client or the group with whom he is working. This sometimes means learning the way of life of the people with whom the sociologist is to counsel (Young, 1955).

Once the practical problem is identified the research operation begins. If a field study is called for, the practical problem must be translated into the sociological one. Proper specification of sociological problems will point up the particular theory and methods needed.

Frequently pressure exists for immediate results. The client or the public concerned cannot or does not wish to wait two or three years to complete a research project. This suggests the desirability of interpreting studies already done. It is not uncommon that more can be accomplished by discovering and interpreting existing knowledge in the time available than by attempting to collect new facts.

The third phase of the research and interpretation process is to interpret sociological subject matter with a bearing on the practical problem which initiated the process. Experience has shown that in interpreting findings a high degree of participation on the part of these who are to use them is important (Mann and Likert, 1952). This may involve reviewing the process of problem definition and collection of data as well as indicating alternative solutions.

SOME HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE PANEL FOR CLARIFICATION

Members of the panel included: Dr. Bob Childers, Region IV, Office of Education, Vocational Education Division, Chairman, Tony Bevacqua (North Carolina), Carl Lamar (Kentucky), Lowell Burkett (AVA), Douglas Towne (Tennessee), and Joe Champagne (Texas).

The panel's discussion centered around the problems of the Research Coordinating Units, and the problem of the dissemination of research findings. The panel felt that much of the available research was not being used. Often, the administrators of vocational education programs do not know about research that is done. The need for program-oriented research was also mentioned. Research into the effectiveness of on-going programs in administration, supervision, and teacher education would provide a valuable management tool.

What procedures and services will be necessary for the Research Coordinating Unit to establish in order to continue to stimulate and facilitate development of proposals to be funded under Part C of the legislation? At least three aspects will need consideration in relationship to this question.

1. How do we make non-occupational researchers aware of trends and needs in occupational education; and how do we make occupational educators aware of trends and needs in the research activities of the more pure disciplines?
2. A second area for our concern is what services relating to information search and information distribution the Research Coordinating Unit will need to establish?

3. What assistance is the RCU capable of providing and what assistance should the RCU provide in the actual preparation of research and research related proposals?

How will the Research Coordinating Unit communicate the limitations involved in "lag time" between research and implementation? It will be necessary for the RCU to instruct and provide counsel for persons regarding the difficulty in the time involved in conducting research and implementing research findings.

How will Research Coordinating Units maintain Federal connections with the U. S. Office of Education? It will be necessary for the Research Coordinating Units to continue their national relationships for various reasons. Perhaps two examples of mundane but very important types of Federal relations would be (1) the coordinating of research efforts between the various states and (2) making available national services such as; the FTS (Federal Telecommunication System) and access to the Defense Documentation Center (DDC).

What role will the Research Coordinating Unit play in relation to the other parts of the 1968 amendments? All parts of the 1968 amendments have various aspects that relate more or less directly to research and developmental activities of interest to Research Coordinating Units. These other parts in addition to Part C must be considered in the future development of all RCU activities.

What will legislation of the future indicate for altering Research Coordinating Unit and State Department of Education roles in research and research related activities? The 1968 amendments represented, to a large degree, dissatisfaction with performance in implementing the 1963 Vocational

Education Act. As can be plainly seen in the 1968 Amendments, much evaluation and study are included as a natural course of events. We must, therefore, do our best to follow the leads given in the 1968 Amendments to assure that research and research related monies are expended in valid and appropriate manners.

STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS OF THE 1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Report of the Work Groups

The major purpose of the small group discussions was somewhat different from the previous day's. Major concern was in making specific suggestions for STRATEGIES that might be followed in a state in realizing most from the provisions for Research and Development in the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. Each group was asked to suggest ways that a state might initiate planning for effective utilization of Research and Development funds as they become available.

A summary of the reports from the groups follows.

Points Needing Further Clarification:

1. Are research funds to be used for research only and for no other purpose?
2. How will research monies be allocated to the States? How will this amount be determined for each State?
3. Can basic appropriations be made but not appropriated?
4. If the full amount is not appropriated, how can on-going projects that cannot be continued in the Commission's share be funded?
5. Must state or local project proposals be matched by total amount of research funds coming into the state or project by project?
6. Can funds in other Sections of the Act (e.g., that for disadvantaged) be used to support research in these areas or are all research monies to come from Section C appropriations?
7. How can we avoid duplication with MDTA provisions and Title III of ESEA?

8. What impact will the amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 have on the role of the RCU in terms of: (a) recommending projects for funding, (b) developing proposals, (c) coordinating research planning efforts, (d) providing research management functions and (e) disseminating research findings?

Suggestions to State Leaders to "Get Ready":

1. Take a look at all research currently being funded in the State.
2. Inventory projects in the State directly or indirectly related to vocational education.
3. States should consider conferences such as this to motivate the further "tooling up" within each State.
4. Look at what has been done or is going on with the handicapped through the use of other funds.
5. Form a State Research Task Force.
6. Look at RCU--its staffing--and examine staffing needs and patterns.
7. Determine who should be involved in final approval of project proposals--develop mechanism for doing this.
8. What criteria should State Advisory Council have for evaluating research efforts?

   (Let's go to the State Advisory Councils with some positive criteria for evaluating our own efforts.)
9. Who shall be charged with management of the research program within the State? RCU personnel should consult with state director to see how this is to be done.

10. Consider setting up panel to review proposals exclusive of the RCU personnel.
11. Part of State Plan should be policies and procedures and functions for operation of the RCU.
12. Determine whether RCU will be expected to do in-house research.
13. Determine whether support for RCU has to be requested in form of project to be funded.
14. Get initial baseline data as basis for later evaluations.
15. Some means of articulating the planning of state and local agencies dealing with occupational education. Provisions for such articulation should be provided in order to develop state and local plans of occupational education which reflect comprehensive and coordinated planning for educational programs for research.
16. A comprehensive plan for conducting and disseminating research in vocational-technical education must be developed as a part of the State Plan in order to effectively utilize the research funds granted to the states under the Vocational Amendments of 1968.

Strategies that Might be Used by State Leaders:

1. The coordination of efforts directed toward planning for, conducting, and disseminating research should be continued through conferences involving state staff, teacher educators, RCU directors and resource persons. The Regional Offices of the USOE and the Center for Occupational Education are potential hosts and planners of such conferences.

2. A linkage between all elements involved in occupational education and the State Advisory Committee for vocational education must be established as soon as the committee is appointed.
3. RCU's should be represented by staff--either full-time or part-time--in State Departments of Public Instruction, Community College Systems, and Teacher Education Institutions in order to provide a liaison research function.
4. The initial drafts of the State Plan should be developed through the coordinated efforts of a task force representing administrators of vocational-technical education, teacher educators in vocational-technical education and representatives of the RCU. Early involvement of the State Advisory Council is a necessary step in the development of state plans and in later evaluations of programs specified in the state plan.

A P P E N D I C E S

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM

Wednesday, November 13, 1968
Cayce Scarborough, Presiding

9:00 a.m. Welcome and Introduction of Guests
Joe E. Champagne, Chairman, Southwide Research Coordinating Council

Orientation to the Conference
Cayce Scarborough, Conference Chairman

9:15 a.m. "Accreditation of Postsecondary Occupational Education Programs in the South"
Felix C. Robb, Director, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

Questions and Discussion

10:00 a.m. "The National Status of Postsecondary Occupational Education Accreditation"
Jerry W. Miller, Associate Director, National Commission on Accrediting

Questions and Discussion

10:45 a.m. Coffee Break

11:15 a.m. "Concerns of the American Vocational Association About Accreditation of Postsecondary Occupational Education and the Relationship of Federal Legislation to Accreditation"
Lowell A. Burkett, Executive Director, American Vocational Association

Questions and Discussion

12:00 Noon Luncheon Break

1:00 p.m. State Efforts Toward Accreditation and Evaluation of Postsecondary Occupational Education--Reports from a few states

Texas----------Ray Barber
Tennessee-------Douglas Towne
North Carolina--Herman Porter
Georgia---------Gene Bottoms
Florida---------J. E. Rishell

2:00 p.m. Organizing Work Groups

2:15 p.m. Small Group Work
"State Inputs to Regional Accreditation"
...Problems, Attitudes and Concerns
...Communication with regional accrediting agency
...Guiding principles for accrediting postsecondary occupational education

3:30 p.m. Work Group Reports

4:00 p.m. Special Meeting of RCU Directors
Joe R. Clary
William W. Stevenson

Thursday, November 14, 1968
Charles H. Rogers, Presiding

9:00 a.m. "The 1968 Vocational Education Amendments and Their Implications for Developing State Research and Development Programs for Occupational Education"
John K. Coster, Director, Center for Occupational Education

9:30 a.m. Reaction to Presentations by Dr. Coster
Harold F. Kaufman, Director Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University

10:00 a.m. Coffee Break

10:30 a.m. Panel for Questions and Clarification of Presentations and Reactions
Bob Childers, Chairman
Anthony Bevacqua
Carl Lamar
Lowell Burkett
Douglas Towne
Joe Champagne

Other Questions and Discussion

11:30 a.m. Organization of Work Groups

12:00 Noon Luncheon Break

1:00 p.m. Small Group Work
"Strategies for Implementing the Research and Development Provisions of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments in the States"

3:00 p.m. Group Reports on Strategies

4:00 p.m. Adjourn

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE, CONSULTANTS, PARTICIPANTS, AND WORK GROUP ASSIGNMENTS

PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE

C. Cayce Scarborough, Head, Department of Agricultural Education, North Carolina State University, Chairman and Conference Director.

John K. Coster, Director, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University.

Charles H. Rogers, Executive Secretary, Southwide Research Coordinating Council for Occupational Education.

CONSULTANTS AND RESOURCE PEOPLE

Lowell A. Burkett, Executive Director, American Vocational Association, Washington, D. C.

B. E. Childers, Director, Vocational-Technical Division, Regional Office of the U. S. Office of Education, Atlanta, Georgia.

John K. Coster, Director, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, North Carolina.

Harold F. Kaufman, Director, Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi.

Jerry W. Miller, Associate Director, National Commission on Accrediting, Washington, D. C.

Felix C. Robb, Director, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, Georgia.

PARTICIPANTS IN

SRCC CONFERENCE ON ACCREDITATION OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE 1968 VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

ALABAMA

Dr. Richard A. Baker, Director
Occupational RCU
Graves Center
Building #1 - Unit B
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Dr. Raymond Hill
Occupational RCU
Graves Center
Building #1 - Unit B
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

Mr. J. F. Ingram, Director
Vocational Education Division
State Department of Education
607 State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36104

ARKANSAS

Dr. Harold Moore
Arkansas RCU for Occupational Education
Department of Vocational Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

Mr. Charles O. Ross
Southwest Technical Institute
Box 45
East Camden, Arkansas 71701

FLORIDA

Dr. Kenneth M. Eaddy, Director
Vocational Programs RCU
Room 254 Knott Building
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Dr. G. W. Neubauer, Director
Program Services
Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education
State Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. J. E. Rishell, Consultant
Teacher Accreditation
State Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. Rex C. Toothman
Southeastern Education Laboratory
220 E. College Avenue
Tallahassee, Florida 23203

GEORGIA

Dr. Grover J. Andrews
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Suite 592
795 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia, 30308

Dr. J. E. (Gene) Bottoms, Director
Occupational Education RCU
State Department of Education
191 Central Avenue, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Mr. J. W. Browne
Regional Office
U. S. Office of Education
50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Dr. R. E. Childers
Region IV Office
U. S. Office of Education
50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

GEORGIA (cont.)

Mr. James Clark, Director
DeKalb Technical Institute
Clarkston, Georgia 30021

Mr. Malcolm Garr
Region IV Office
U. S. Office of Education
50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Mr. Barry L. Mellinger, Ass't. Executive Secretary
College Commission
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Suite 592
795 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Mr. George Mulling, Director
Vocational Education Division
State Department of Education
191 Central Avenue, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Mr. Fred Otte
State Department of Education
191 Central Avenue, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dr. Felix Robb, Director
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Suite 592
795 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

Mr. Marion H. Scott
State Department of Education
191 Central Avenue, S. W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30601

Mr. Ralph H. Tolbert
University of Georgia
Lucy Cobb Hall
Athens, Georgia 30601

Mr. James Wiche
Region IV Office
U. S. Office of Education
50 Seventh Street, N. E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

KENTUCKY

Dr. Harold R. Binkley
University of Kentucky
College of Education
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Dr. Carl F. Lamar, Ass't. State Superintendent
Vocational Education Division
State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dr. Robert Lee Ogle
Advisory Committee for Vocational-Technical-Industrial Teacher Ed.
Eastern Kentucky University
Richmond, Kentucky 40475

Dr. Clayton Omvig
Kentucky RCU
Vocational Education Division
College of Education
152 Taylor Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

LOUISIANA

Dr. Houston C. Jenks
Southwest Education Research Laboratory
5880 Florida Boulevard
Room 302, Equitable Life Building
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

MISSISSIPPI

Dr. Harold F. Kaufman
Social Science Research Center
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi 39762

Dr. James E. Wall, Director
Mississippi RCU
Box JW
Mississippi State University
State College, Mississippi 39762

NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Anthony J. Bevacqua, Director
Department of Community Colleges
State Department of Education
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Dr. William J. Brown, Ass't. Director
North Carolina RCU
Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. Joe R. Clary, Director
North Carolina RCU
Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. John K. Coster, Director
Center for Occupational Education
Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. Charles V. Mercer
Center for Occupational Education
Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Mr. G. Herman Porter
Department of Community Colleges
Education Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. Charles H. Rogers, Coordinator Services and Conferences
Center for Occupational Education
Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. C. C. Scarborough, Head
Department of Agricultural Education
123 Tompkins Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. Bert W. Westbrook
Center for Occupational Education
Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Dr. Charles F. Ward
Industrial and Technical Education
Achievement Measures Project
P. O. Box 5314
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

OKLAHOMA

Dr. William W. Stevenson, Director
Vocational Research Coordinating Unit
Room 302, Gunderson Hall
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. Tom P. Reid
South Carolina Technical Education
Pendleton, South Carolina 29670

Dr. John H. Rodgers, Director
Vocational Education RCU
School of Education
101 Godfrey Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina 29631

TENNESSEE

Mr. Charles M. Dunn, State Director
Vocational Education Division
State Department of Education
205 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Dr. Douglas C. Towne, Director
Occupational Research & Development Coordinating Unit
University of Tennessee
909 Mountcastle Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

TEXAS

Mr. Ray Barber, Director
Texas RCU
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78711

Dr. J. E. Champagne, Associate
Director
Human Resources Programs
210 Heyne Building
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77004

VIRGINIA

Dr. A. Martin Eldersveld
Associate Director for
Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Community Colleges
911 East Broad Street
P. O. Box 1558
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Mr. George S. Orr, Assistant Supt.
Vocational Education Division
State Department of Education
Richmond, Virginia 23216

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Lowell A. Burkett
Executive Director
American Vocational Association
1510 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Mr. Jerry Miller
Associate Director
National Commission on Accrediting
1785 Massachusetts Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. Charles Divita, Jr.
West Virginia RCU
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

Dr. Vernon A. Kahout, Coordinator
of Vocational Guidance
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
P. O. Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325

WORK GROUP ASSIGNMENTS

GROUP # 1

Rex Toothman, Chairman (SE-REL)
Bert Westbrook, Recorder (COE)

J. F. Ingram	Vocational Education Director	Alabama
Fred Otte	Research Coordinating Unit	Georgia
R. H. Tolbert	Teacher Education	Georgia
Barry Mellinger	Southern Assoc. of Colleges & Schools	Georgia
Dan Arnold	Research Coordinating Unit	Kentucky
Tony Bevacqua	Post-Secondary Occupational Ed. Director	North Carolina
Charlie Dunn	Vocational Education Director	Tennessee
Ray Barber	Research Coordinating Unit	Texas
Harold Kaufman	Social Science Research Center	Mississippi
Charles Divita	Research Coordinating Unit	West Virginia

GROUP # 2

Bob Elsea, Chairman (REL)
Bill Brown, Recorder (RCU)

Richard Baker	Research Coordinating Unit	Alabama
George Mulling	Vocational Education Director	Georgia
Gordon Andrews	Southern Assoc. of Colleges & Schools	Georgia
Jim Rishell	State Accreditation	Florida
Robert Ogle	Teacher Education	Kentucky
Luther Garrett	Vocational Education (Dir. Rep.)	Mississippi
Douglas Towne	Research Coordinating Unit	Tennessee
Joe Godsey	Post-Secondary Occup. Ed. Director	Texas
Lowell Burkett	American Vocational Association	D. C.
Vernon Kahout	Regional Education Laboratory	West Virginia

GROUP # 3

Gene Bottoms, Chairman (Georgia Vocational Education)
Charles Mercer, Recorder (COE)

Raymond Hill	Research Coordinating Unit	Alabama
John Lloyd	Post-Secondary Occupational Ed.	Georgia
Ken Eaddy	Research Coordinating Unit	Florida
Carl Lamar	Vocational Education Director	Kentucky
Houston Jenks	Regional Education Laboratory	Louisiana
Joe Champagne	SRCC Chairman	Texas
Herman Porter	State Accreditation	N. C.
John Rodgers	Research Coordinating Unit	S. C.
George Orr	Vocational Education (Dir. Rep.)	Virginia
Jerry Miller	National Comm. on Accreditation	D. C.

GROUP # 4

Jim Wall, Chairman (RCU)
Joe Clary, Recorder (RCU)

Charles Ross	Post-Secondary Occupational Ed, (Dir. Rep.)	Arkansas
Bob Childers	Regional Vocational Ed. Director	Georgia
Felix Robb	Southern Assoc. of Colleges & Schools	Georgia
G. W. Neubauer	Vocational Education (Dir. Rep.)	Florida
Harold Binkley	Teacher Education	Kentucky
Clay Omvig	Research Coordinating Unit	Kentucky
John Coster	COE Director	N. C.
Bill Stevenson	Research Coordinating Unit	Oklahoma
Jack Mullins	Regional Ed. Lab. - Tech. Ed. Comm.	S. C.
Martin Eldersveld	Post-Secondary Occupational Ed.	Virginia

APPENDIX C

A REPORT ON OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION*

Recent technological developments and changes in our society have made necessary the expanding of opportunities for occupationally oriented education. Business and industry can no longer depend upon developing new employees into productive individuals by merely exposing them to the highly specialized and changing manufacturing processes. Individuals without skills must acquire organized instruction to reach and maintain the level of productivity necessary to compete and advance in today's employment market.

Historical

Recognizing the need and benefits of voluntary evaluation and accreditation activities to educational programs, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools became more actively and directly concerned with the developing programs of occupational education. In September, 1966, the Executive Council of the Commission on Colleges requested a study of the question of recognition through accreditation of post-secondary, non-collegiate, non-profit vocational and technical education.

In April, 1967, a Southwide Conference on Occupational Education was held in Atlanta, financed by grants from The Southern Company and the Southern Bell Telephone Company. Representatives from business, industry, and vocational education met and asked the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to pursue aggressively activities to help strengthen the quality, availability, and status of public and private non-profit technical and vocational education, including evaluation and accreditation.

---

*Proceedings of the Seventy-Third Meeting Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Atlanta: The Association, 1968, pp. 36-37.

In June, 1967, the Board of Trustees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools authorized the appointment of an ad hoc committee* to utilize a report entitled "We Shall Not Rest"** (summarizing the April, 1967, Southwide Conference) and to suggest a plan of further development for the Association's involvement in occupational education. This committee was appointed, met periodically in the fall of 1967, and proposed at the annual meeting of the Association in Dallas, Texas, in November of that year, specifications for, and the establishment of, a regular Committee on Occupational Education of the Southern Association. At that time, the Trustees approved in principle the initial proposal and asked the ad hoc committee to make further study of the status of occupational education in the South and to develop specifications for the permanent committee.

On June 17, 1968, the Board of Trustees received the final amended report of the ad hoc committee on occupational education and heard the results of a fact-gathering study of occupational education in the South. This study was conducted for the Southern Association by the Southwide

---

*The ad hoc committee's membership was as follows: Dr. Raymond G. Christian, Chairman, Superintendent of Schools, Birmingham, Alabama; Mr. Fred Bartel, Director, Jeffersontown Vocational Schools, Jeffersontown, Kentucky; Mrs. Ellen B. Coody, Executive Secretary, Georgia Vocational Association, Atlanta, Georgia; Dr. John T. Coster, Director, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, North Carolina; Mr. Fred C. Fore, Director, Florence-Darlington Technical Institute; Florence, South Carolina; Mr. Robert H. Hudson, Training Department Manager, Lockheed-Georgia Company, Marietta, Georgia; Mr. George Mulling, Director of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia; Dr. Jack P. Nix, Superintendent, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia; Dr. Alvin Thomas, President, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical University, Prairie View, Texas; Fred D. Wright Company, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee.

**Felix C. Robb, "We Shall Not Rest," Atlanta: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1967.

Research Coordinating Council in Occupational Education and was presented by
by Dr. John K. Coster, Director, Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, on behalf of SRCC.* The Trustees then unanimously adopted the amended report of the ad hoc committee on occupational education, and authorized appointment of the regular Committee on Occupational Education, and added provision for an operating budget of up to $30,000 to launch the program in 1968-69. It was understood that as money from outside sources is obtained, the Association is to be reimbursed.

Policy Group

In September, 1968, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Committee on Occupational Education was appointed by the Association's President, Dr. Andrew D. Holt, and convened October 8, 1968, for its first meeting at Association headquarters in Atlanta.** Dr. Felix Robb, Director

---

*John K. Coster, The Role of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in Improving the Quantity and Quality of Programs of Occupational Education. Occasional Paper No. 2. Raleigh: Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University, 1968.

**Membership of the new Committee on Occupational Education is as follows: Mr. James F. Clark, Chairman, Director, DeKalb Area Technical School, Clarkston, Georgia; Mr. Ted Boaz, Dean, Del Mar Technical Institute of Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, Texas; Mr. W. A. Bourne, Principal, Memphis Technical High School, Memphis, Tennessee; Mr. Sidney N. Collier, Director, Orleans Area Vocational-Technical School, New Orleans, Louisiana; Mr. McDonald Hughes, Principal, Druid High School, Tuscaloosa, Alabama; Dr. Carl F. Lamar, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky; Dr. George Mehallis, Director, Technical, Vocational and Semiprofessional Studies, Miami-Dade Junior College, Miami, Florida; Mr. George Mulling, Director, Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Georgia; Dr. Carl W. Proehl, Assistant Superintendent, Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida; Dr. Felix C. Robb, Director, Southern Association, ex officio.

of the Association, served as presiding officer pending the selection of a chairman of the Committee. Dr. Robb briefly reviewed the national scene with regard to occupational education and the history of the Southern Association's interest in the field of occupational education. The Committee examined many considerations such as national legislation and its effect on occupational education. The Committee, its composition and objectives were reviewed along with the prospect of employing an Executive Secretary and expansion of the Committee to enlarge the scope of representation. The appointment of an industrial and business advisory board was discussed along with the need for funding in the initial period of Committee operation.

Second Meeting Held

The second meeting of the Committee on Occupational Education took place on December 2, 1968, in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in Atlanta. Dr. A. D. Holt, President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, met with and welcomed the Committee on Occupational Education into the Association. Dr. Holt emphasized the need for development of standards and evaluative criteria which use a practical approach to such considerations as equipment and personnel. He charged the Committee to pursue such activities aggressively.

Mr. Jerry Miller, Associate Director of the National Commission on Accrediting, discussed national interest and activities leading toward setting standards and to accreditation of occupational education.

The Committee analyzed and studied other activities related to self-evaluation and accreditation of occupational education which are being carried on in the Southern Association region and elsewhere.

The Committee discussed the parameters of its overall interest and indicated a feeling of concern for the development and improvement of occupational education at whatever level it is found. It further identified its initial effort as being with the post-high school, non-collegiate, non-profit institutions which offer occupational education and which are not already covered by either of the Southern Association's other commissions.

Futher consideration was given to the selection of an Executive Secretary. However, information from additional applicants was expected and no action was taken. There was some discussion regarding the Business-Industry-Professions Advisory Board to be developed to guide the Committee and Association activities relating to occupational education.

It was noted that considerable interest in accreditation of occupational education by the Southern Association has been indicated by various institutions and individuals involved in occupational education. The Committee plans to begin preparations at the February, 1969, meeting of basic criteria which would provide interested institutions with directions for becoming affiliated with the Association's new program in occupational education. It is anticipated that these criteria will be distributed by March 1, 1969.